the floor...*(Interruptions)*. Will you please resume your place?...*(Interruptions)*. This is not the subject under discussion.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, first of all, I would like to respond to the common points which the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Yechury have made and Shri Amar Singh has also associated himself with Mr. Yechury about the sense of the House and give values to the democracy. Before that, I would like to make one point. I have no intention of joining the controversy, because the period which he has referred, I have great respect for former President, former Defence Minister, Mr. Venkataraman, who was my colleague. I worked with him during 1970s. When he was the Member of the Planning Commission, I was Minister. In fact, I replaced him as the Finance Minister when he went to Defence. Please, remember, he was the Defence Minister from 1982 to 1984 till he was elected the Vice-President. The Prime Minister of the country was Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Am I to believe that Mrs. Indira Gandhi, under the pressure of the United States of America, succumbed and compelled and gave up the test? I am leaving it there. Sir, in respect of the sense of the House, we have never said that we will take the sense of the House. Let the process be completed. We have begun the process; the process is not yet complete. Let me complete....*(Interruptions)*. Let me complete. This is most unfortunate that I have listened to them....*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: What Mr. Yechury told...*(Interruptions)*...it is most unfortunate...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members are requested to resume their places...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, we are walking out.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, as you are not agreeing we are walking out.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Sir, we are walking out.

(At this stage, some hon. Members left the Chamber)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: It is most unfortunate that they are running out. If it happened, it happened in the case of CTBT. It is not for the first time that American Senate rejected the proposal of the President. If it rejects the proposal, 123 Agreement, on which I will take the sense of the House, you please tell me, on what I will take the sense of the House, because the Bill has not come. The Bill does not come to exist....*(Interruptions)*. Why are these people making noise? What type of people they are? Therefore, there is no reason. They have no case. They have left. It is for them to decide. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The discussion on this subject is now concluded. Now, we go to the next item.

GOVERNMENT BILL

The Jawaharlal Institute of Post-Graduate Medical Education and Research, Puducherry Bill, 2007

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (DR. ANBUMANI RAM DOSS): Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill to declare the institution known as the Jawaharlal Institute of Post-graduate Medical Education and Research, Puducherry, to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its incorporation and matters connected therewith, to be taken into consideration.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any Member desiring to speak may do so. Mr. Narayanasamy.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): Sir, Mr. Apte is here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Shri Balwant Apte.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Sir, Members are not present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, one Member is present.

SHRI BALAVANT *ALIAS* BALAPTE (Maharashtra): Sir, I am very much here. I thought that my name would be called out and, therefore, I waited. It was not free for all. Or, was it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, go ahead.

SHRI BALAVANT *ALIAS* BALAPTE: Sir, I rise to give my views on this Bill, which, in the ultimate analysis, will be a good effort. But, the process, through which it has gone, painfully realises that this Government does not mean honest business. Sir, we need institute of excellence in medicine both for teaching and public service throughout the country. When the matter arose the other day, we were told that we could establish institutes only in Union Territories and nowhere else. But, the fact remains that entry 64 gives ample scope to the Central Government to establish such institutions throughout the country. In fact, the earlier Government had proposed to have six such institutes of excellence throughout the country which will give education as well as render effective public service in matters of medical treatment. For reasons best known to them, the present Government abandoned that excellent scheme, as it had tended to do with several other schemes and for the first three years of its governance, the country has suffered. The schemes for infrastructure development, for development of roads, for inter-linking of rivers, which were taking people on the road of progress, were halted irrationally in a manner which was totally partisan and, therefore, did not go with national interest.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN, (PROF. P.J. KURIEN), in the Chair.]

The establishment of the institutes also had the same fate. But now, probably the Government has woken up to the need for establishment of such institutes, and, therefore, has sought. ...*(Interruptions)*.. Sir, in an empty House, I must, at least, have your attention.

The establishment of this institute, which was already there since 1964 as a statutory body, under the aegis of the Central Government, maybe with assured financial support, is sought by this Bill. Insofar as incorporation of this institute and its governance is concerned, the objects talk about academic autonomy and then the proposal shows that the autonomy which is termed to be academic will be illusory if the present structure is permitted to hold. Sir,

autonomy is not something which can be confined to determination of courses, particularly, in a medical institute where you train doctors and you render simultaneously excellent medical service to the people at large, particularly, to the have-nots.Therefore, talking of academic autonomy is hollow if the institution is not fully autonomous. If you treat the full autonomy of an institute of medical education in a manner in which it ought not have to be done, every institute in the country will suffer the same tragedy as the All India Institute of Medical Sciences in New Delhi has suffered during the last one year or more.

Sir, the institutes cannot depend upon the whims and fancies of the powers that be, particularly the Health Minister. They are not run by the persons whom he likes; and the persons whom he dislikes should not be removed.

This Bill guarantees one more empire to the Minister for Health to deal casually with personnel, to deal casually with dignified people, and to deal casually with persons who have medical excellence but who are poor in subserving him.

The attempt in the All India Institute of Medical Sciences by the Health Minister is a pointer to which this Government will tend to go, will stoop to go, to hamper both autonomy and service. I, therefore, believe that the present institute will also suffer the same tragedy as the institute in Delhi is suffering.

Sir, I had the privilege of reading the report of the Committee on this headed by Shri Amar Singh. It has also pointed out that this autonomy is very important. They, in fact, recommended in this Bill that the Minister should not be a Member of the Institute and should not be an ex officio President. The Bill provided this. Fortunately, some wisdom has dawned and they have removed the inclusion of the Minister. But the Secretary is very much there.

Therefore, Sir, my first submission before you is that the concept of autonomy is not merely determining courses; the concept of autonomy includes the administration of the institution, particularly because it is at the same time a teaching institution as well as an institution for public service. This autonomy has to be ensured. After the Report of the Standing Committee, the amendments, which are sought to be made here, are, in a way, very cosmetic. Only one clause is changed.

Therefore, I would urge upon the Government to go back on this Bill and bring a Bill which will establish an autonomous institution of excellence which this country needs.

In so far as the administrative autonomy is concerned, it always depends upon the finances which an institution gets. Those who pay the piper, they say, call the tune.That should not be the situation. The financial support to the institutions should be granted and the Ministry has only that role to play. The Ministry cannot determine things, and therefore, to ensure this autonomy, the appointment of persons on the Governing Body, the appointment of the Director, should be through a process which will ensure that that autonomy is fully protected.

Secondly, Sir, in so far as the functioning of the Institute is concerned, the employees, the staff and the students are the essential part of an institution. In fact, if an institution is academic, then the student is at the centre of the institution. Today, if the administration does not think about the welfare of the students and the staff, particularly in a medical institution, the residents, then the administration goes haywire, the interests suffer, the institute suffers, the students suffer, and the public suffers. Therefore, it is imperative that

these interests are represented in the administration. Participation is really the gravamen of any democracy, of any governance, and therefore, I would urge that the governance of this Institute should include the representatives of the employees, the staff and the students. Sir, my submission to this House is that unless you do it, time and again, there will be disruption in the activities. The resident doctors have genuine grievances, and those grievances are never addressed unless they go on strike, and if they go on strike, then it is a step against the people, because a medical doctor is considered to be a God, and therefore, they suffer both ways. The people are against them and the administration is against them. All over the country, in so far as public hospitals are concerned, the resident doctors work much more than what they are paid for. I know in most of these hospitals, the resident doctors work almost for 24 hours continuously. They are always on 24 hours duty, and they are not looked after, and a time comes when they consolidate and agitate. If this particular malady is to be addressed, I would urge that they should be represented effectively in the management so that they will be responsible and their grievances will also be addressed. With these, I would suggest that the Government should not proceed with this Bill without making proper amendments. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Puducherry): Hon'ble Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Jawaharlal Institute of Post Graduate Medical Education and Research, Puducherry Bill, 2007. Sir, I am from Puducherry. I know the Institute very well. I am grateful to the late Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was a visionary, who thought that in southern parts of the country, there should be a medical institute of excellence. In fact, Sir, all attempts were made to bring that Institute to Tamil Nadu, but Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru intervened and said that Institute of Clinical Excellence, the Research Institute, should be in Puducherry. Earlier, it was Pondicherry. Amar Singh ji is the Chairman of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Health and Family Welfare. He knows about it. He could not go there. His team went there. I was also a member of the Advisory Committee of this Institute. This Institute has been catering to the needs of the patients, not only from Puducherry, but also from Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Karnataka. The daily outdoor patients, who come there for medical treatment, their number is more than 5,000.

Apart from that, the in-patient facilities and various other faculties have been started. Research work has also been started. But the budget allocation for the Institute was not up to the expectations. The Director, who has been appointed earlier, even the Government of India gave money, was not able to acquire equipment for surgeries, especially, for heart surgery, orthopaedics and even for ophthalmology. They were not able to do it because of the cumbersome procedures. For every sanction, the file has to go to the Ministry of Health and Family Affairs, and by the time the file returns back the cost of equipment will go up, at least, by 50 per cent within six months. Even in the case of appointment of professors, assistant professor and the staff, it takes a lot of time. I have made in this august House several submissions stating that the doctors, who have been appointed there from the all-India quota, go to JIPMER because there is a doctors' quota in the Institute for the admission of their children. They work there for six months and after getting admission for their children in the Institute, they get transferred to another place. They don't stay there. Minimum 50 per cent of the posts at the levels of professors, assistant professors and lecturers are lying vacant. Therefore, time and again, we have been pleading with the Government of India that more powers should be given to this Institute. Considering that, I am grateful to the hon. Minister for taking a lot of interest. Apart from that, certain obstacles have been created to

prevent this Institute from becoming autonomous. We also know that and that is why this Bill has been brought to this august House. This Bill was brought for the purpose of giving autonomous status to the Jawaharlal Institute of Post-Graduate Medical Education and Research. There was some agitation and there were some apprehensions in the mind of the employees who are working there. They have been saying that their service conditions will be changed and there will not be regular growth for the Institute. They have these apprehensions. From time to time, discussions were held between the employees and the medical authorities at the Joint Secretary and the Director levels. They met the employees and they tried to remove the apprehensions in their mind. I would like to submit that, as a person coming from that area, we will not compromise on three things: (1) better patient care; (2) employees' interests; (3) Institute's interests. On these three things there should not be any compromise because it is the only Institute in the entire South India which equals the AIIMS and the PG Institute at Chandigarh. When the employees met me, I made it clear to them that their service conditions would be protected; there would be no victimisation; regular opportunities for promotion of the employees would not be hampered. In the case of JIPMER, for all-India competition, there are several examination centres in the whole country. They write all-India examination and the students are selected through this examination. There are 75 seats. For other States, the quota has been fixed at 20. The local boys and girls are selected because only the top students go to this Institute. That should be protected. I would request the hon. Minister that since the Institute is located there, the local students' interests should not be compromised. The minimum of 20 seats for other States, as has been continuing, should be continued by the hon. Minister. I would like to request him to maintain that.

Sir, the hon. Minister comes from a place which is just 20 kilometres away from this Institute. He is also interested in developing this Institute. The employees want that this Institute should become par excellence. We, Members of Parliament, also want that this Institute should cater to the needs of the patients not only in Puducherry but also South India. Poor patients are getting treatment there. We are very much concerned about it. The hon. Minister was saying that poor patients should be treated free of cost. I am very glad to know it. I would request the hon. Minister to clarify it. The policy of the UPA Government under the National Health Mission is that the poorer sections of the society should be given free treatment. I would request the hon. Minister to confirm whether this aspect is being taken care of or not. The hon. Chairman of the Standing Committee on Health and Family Welfare stated that this Institute is of national importance. Yes, this Institute is of national importance. There is a clause in the Bill which says that two Members of Parliament from that State, one from Lok Sabha and one from Rajya Sabha, will become members of this Institute for the purpose of giving proper advice. But the Standing Committee made a recommendation that it should not be the two Members of Parliament from that State, these two Members should be from among the Members of Parliament throughout the country. I do not know why Shri Amar Singh is angry with me. A person coming from the State is normally there in the....*(Interruptions)*. That is what I am saying. He does not want Narayanasamy to be there. That may be the reason.

SHRI AMAR SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I want to clarify one thing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Narayanasamy, are you yielding?

SHRI AMAR SINGH: He has mentioned my name.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I have mentioned about the Committee.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: I want to clarify it. Sir, you are also, incidentally, esteemed Member of the Standing Committee on Health and Family Welfare. This Committee functions very democratically. I simply do what a majority of the Members want me to do. I will be very happy if my esteemed colleague and my friend is there in the Committee. I don't have anything against him. The interest of Puducherry is supreme in my mind.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I would like to submit that there is a Central University in Puducherry. In that University, Members of Parliament from that State are the members to give advice. That is the system we follow everywhere. This is the system which we have been following. The objection of the hon. Member is also...

SHRI BALAVANT ALIAS BAL APTE: Sir, you are giving more time to the Treasury Benches. When I was speaking, you rang the bell in five minutes.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, my Party has 18 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Narayanasamy, just a minute. Please sit down. This is very unfair to cast aspersions on the Chair. Since you raised this point, listen to me. Your Party had 12 minutes and the time you have taken is 13 minutes, from 2.15 p.m. to 2.28 p.m. While you were speaking, your Party gave another name to me directly and requested that he should also be called. I agreed. You should understand that you have exhausted your Party's time and taken one minute more and then you are complaining. Your Party gave another name also. The Congress Party has 18 minutes. Mr. Narayanasamy started at 2.28 p.m. He has taken only 11 minutes. Now, he has got seven minutes more. Actually, he would have concluded before that. Now you have made me to stop him, he will take another seven minutes.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I want five minutes more because I am from that area.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Apte, as per your suggestion, I should not call your party colleague because your party's time has already been exhausted. But the Chair has some discretion, and we try to accommodate maximum speakers. So, don't question the Chair. That is what I am telling you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there is one area where we are proud of our Institute. The students, who are selected for this Institute, are poor children. It was the mission of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru that children coming from the rural areas should get medical education. That is being continued. Even the fee, that is collected from the students, does not exceed more than Rs.10,000 per year, including the hostel facilities. We cannot imagine this kind of a fee structure in today's world where medical education has become a very costly affair. But, in this Institute, this low fee structure has been maintained for years together. Therefore, I want the hon. Minister to see to it that the fee structure is not altered. A lot of improvements have to be done in this Institute because this is not only an ordinary medical college, but it is also a medical Education and Research Institute. In this Research Institute, medical research should be given prime importance by the authorities. When the hon. Minister makes it an autonomous body, the allocation of funds should not be a problem. I am indeed glad that the hon. Minister had allocated more funds from his Ministry even earlier. But I want the special attention of the hon. Minister to make it on par with the All India Institute of Medical Sciences and the PGIMER at Chandigarh because, as the hon. Minister

2821RS—15A

himself said, these are the three Institutes in which a lot of research work is being done. Several faculties have been opened in the other two Institutes, and the hon. Minister should bring JIPMER on par with the other Institutes, which are there in the North India.

Another point is that you have given the candidates two options; they can either continue as employees of this Institute, or, they can also become Government servants. You have given them these options because there is a recommendation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee that the employees should be given one year's time instead of six months. This may kindly be considered by the Government because one year is a sufficient time, instead of six months, and, on this, I entirely agree with the hon. Committee.

Sir, a recommendation has been made that the hon. Minister should not be the Chairman of the Institute, which has been accepted by the Government. As far as the Director or the Chairman is concerned, he is going to be a professional. And the Government is accepting this.

Further, I would like the hon. Minister to lay special emphasis on three or four areas. No.1 is the neuro surgery. As we all know, a lot of accident cases are coming there. So, neuro surgery should be given prime importance by the Government. Secondly, a lot of poor patients come there for heart surgery. As it is, this hospital extends free treatment for heart surgery to the poor people. But, unfortunately, the doctors, are giving them time for operation in 2011 and 2012. How can a heart patient keep himself alive for seven to eight years without proper treatment? I want the hon. Minister to see to it that this Department is strengthened, and there should be more number of doctors in this Department. In other countries, we find that they have got facilities for heart surgery even in the interior places. The third is the Orthopaedics Department. This Department is doing a good job. I want the hon. Minister to see to it that this Department is strengthened, considering the amount of fatal cases that are coming here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Mr. Barun Mukherjee.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, the Orthopaedics Department ...*(Interruption)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't talk with your back turned to the Chair. There are certain ...*(Interruptions)*... I don't know why..*(Interruption)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, surely, more patients, especially physically handicapped patients, would get treatment from the hospital.

Then, Sir, there are a lot of path labs in the hospital. More facilities need to be provided. I am not a Doctor; the hon. Minister is a Doctor. He knows how to improve the institute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, the Government of India is giving Rs. 500 crores for AIIMS and about Rs. 300 crores to PGI, Chandigarh. The allocation that has been made for JIPMER, even though it is a research institute, is less. I would like the hon. Minister to see to it that the allocation of funds towards developing the institute is increased.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I shall make just one more point and then conclude.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, your party's time is over. Whatever

time you take now is extra.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I would like the hon. Minister to introduce more Post Graduate courses. That is very important here, because when you make it a research institute there should be more Post Graduate courses so that students passing out from there could go in for research work. Therefore, there should be more Post Graduate courses to which students can be admitted.

Sir, I am grateful for the efforts made by the hon. Minister to develop this institute. This Bill would help poor patients, the students and also the employees. I would like the hon. Minister to give categorical assurance that the employees will not be victimized and that their interests would be safeguarded. Ultimately, as I said, instead of six months they should make it one year in respect of other Government servants or employees of this institute.

With these words, I support the Bill and I would like the House to unanimously approve the Bill. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Sir, I have to go for a meeting of the Health Committee and so, I would like to speak first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay. Mr. Amar Singh.

श्री अमर सिंह: आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बिल इस सदन में आज रखा गया है। इसके पहले मैंने इसके बारे में एक रपट अपनी स्थायी समिति की तरफ से सदन के पटल पर रखी थी, जिसके माननीय सदस्य स्वयं आप भी हैं। जिन मुद्दों के बारे में हमारे वरिष्ठ साथी श्री नारायणसामी जी विस्तार से कह रहे थे, उन सभी मुद्दों पर हमने अपनी रिपोर्ट में विस्तार से बताया है। मेरी वरिष्ठ साथी श्रीमती वृंदा कारत जी भी—जो इस बिल का प्रारूप आया है, उसमें और स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में काफी समानता नहीं थी। कई मुद्दे हैं, जिनमें एक प्रमुख मुद्दा यह भी था कि माननीय मंत्री जी इसके अध्यक्ष नहीं होंगे, ताकि इसकी स्वायत्तता, ऑटोनॉमी कायम रखी जाए, उसको तिरोहित कर दिया गया था, लेकिन वृंदा जी के कहने से, हम लोगों के कहने से और नारायणसामी जी तथा सभी सदस्यों के कहने के बाद सरकार ने उसमें कुछ बदलाव लाने का उपक्रम किया है। लेकिन, मैं बड़े आदर के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी: यह कैबिनेट का डिसीज़न है।

श्री अमर सिंह: ठीक है, यह कैबिनेट का डिसीज़न है ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह कह रहे हैं कि कैबिनेट का डिसीज़न है। अत: इन लोगों के प्रस्ताव पर कैबिनेट ने यह डिसीज़न लिया है, बदलाव लाया है, इसके लिए हम कैबिनेट को धन्यवाद देते हैं। लेकिन, मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि जो दो-तीन बातें नारायणसामी जी ने कही हैं, उनमें उन्होंने कहा है कि इंस्टीट्यूट की ऑटोनॉमी और गरीब मरीजों की सुरक्षा तथा गरीब विद्यार्थियों की भर्ती, इन बातों पर विचार करने के लिए कहा गया है। इन सभी मुद्दों को भी हमने अपनी रिपोर्ट में संदर्भित किया है। मंत्री जी हमारे मित्र हैं और बहुत अच्छे व्यक्ति हैं, लेकिन पता नहीं क्यों हर मामले में स्टैंडिंग कमेटी से, जिसमें इनके दल के भी लोग हैं, हमारे दल के भी लोग हैं तथा जिसमें पूरी संसद का प्रतिनिधित्व है...।

महोदय, मुझे मालूम है कि यह mandatory नहीं है कि स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को सरकार माने, लेकिन अगर स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को नहीं मानना है और सरकार को अपने मनमाने ढंग से ही बिल लाना है, तो फिर मेरा आप के माध्यम से सरकार से अनुरोध है कि वह इस स्टैंडिंग कमेटी की व्यवस्था को समाप्त कर दे। महोदय, हम लोगों को काफी समय देना पड़ता है, काम करना पड़ता है और उस में कोई राजनीति नहीं है। महोदय, स्टैंडिंग कमेटी में सभी दल के लोग सामूहिक रूप से बिना राजनीति के काम करते हैं। मेरा सौभाग्य है कि आप भी हमारी कमेटी के सदस्य हैं और उस के बाद हम कहते हैं कि गरीबों की भर्ती का इंतजाम हो, पढ़ाई-लिखाई में फीस का ज्यादा प्रारूप न हो और अगर हम कहते हैं कि मुफ्त इलाज की व्यवस्था

चलती रहे, अगर हम कहते हैं कि इसकी ऑटॉनोमी बरकरार रहे तो इसमें हम ऐसी कोई बात नहीं कह रहे हैं जिस को मानने में दिक्कत हो।

महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी युवा हैं, उत्साही हैं और डॉक्टर भी हैं। मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर वह अपने अंदर देने की प्रवृत्ति लाएं और सभी को साथ लेकर चलने की प्रवृत्ति लाएं तो जो सदैव विवाद से घिरे रहने की एक वृत्ति उन के नेतृत्व में चल रही है, उस से उन की काफी बचत होगी। मैं उन को सलाह देने की स्थिति और हैसियत मे नहीं हूं। इसलिए मेरी विनती है कि कम-से-कम स्टेंडिंग कमेटी में हम लोगों ने जो संस्तुतियां की हैं और हमारी वरिष्ठ साथी वृंदा कारत जी ने जो उस में बदलाव की बात रखी है, उसके ऊपर सरकार कैबिनेट के थ्रू, जैसाकि हमारे साथी ने कहा है, विचार-विमर्श कर के इस बिल के प्रारूप को बदले ताकि स्टेंडिंग कमेटी के सभी सदस्यों के मान-सम्मान की रक्षा हो सके, हमारी भावनाओं और पांडिचेरी के गरीब लोगों की भावनाओं की व जन-हित की सुरक्षा की जा सके। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): Sir, it is a very unfortunate situation that on behalf of my party, I cannot extend support to the Bill in its present form. I have already spoken to the Minister, this morning, and I had informed the Government also yesterday that in its present form, the Bill is unacceptable to us. Why is that so, Sir? I would just like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that for the last two years, there has been an agitation going on in Puducherry, cutting across party lines, driven by the concerns of the people of Puducherry, that an Institute, which has served...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Can you yield for a minute? It is not cutting across party lines. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Do you yield Mrs. Karat?

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: I am not yielding. Why should I yield to Mr. Narayanasamy who has already taken so much time of the House? Now, he wants to encroach on my time. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Let us not give wrong information to the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no; Mr. Narayanasamy. She is not yielding. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, I am giving the correct information. He may not be there. But, I want to say, Sir, that for two years, there has been this popular agitation, cutting across party lines, on the issue of this Bill. Now, in the case of a Bill which is for the autonomy of the institution and a Bill which is going to help the Institute and which is supposed to help the people of that area, normally, there should not be an agitation against such a Bill. So, where does the gap come? Why is it that today in public perception, in Puducherry, the *aam aadmi* and the people of that area believe that this Bill is not going to benefit them? In fact, it is going to take away some of the facilities that they enjoy. Shri Amar Singhji has very correctly pointed to the Standing Committee's Report, and I entirely share his views that once the Standing Committee gives recommendations, the Government should give far more attention and seriousness to those recommendations, more so, when they coincide with the feelings of the people of that particular area. There are three basic issues of this Bill which have not been reflected, and therefore, I oppose the Bill. The first point is that this Institute is unique in the sense that generally in India, where, due to privatisation policies, the provision of health has become more or less an instrument for profit and *loot* of the people, this

Institute, because of the instinctive devotion of the faculty, of the doctors, of the staff a the policies of successive Governments of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry, has ensured that poor people of a much larger region can get healthcare free of cost. I know, Mr. Narayanasa has talked about the UPA Government's policies to ensure cheap health care for the B card-holders, etc. But we know that even in the capital of this country, user fees are be charged even from the poor people. In fact, it is extremely difficult now for the poor peopl access free health care. The uniqueness of the institute in Puducherry is that it is provid such care.

If you look at the objects of the institute, Sir, I would draw the attention of the Memb to clause 13. From (a) to (o), all kinds of objects have been mentioned in this Bill. Howev the basic object for this institute is well known and it is reflected in the Statement of Obje and Reasons, namely, "this institute has been providing quality education and excell patient care delivery services over the years." It is there in the Objects and Reasons. Bu you look at the objects of the institute, it is missing, entirely. Now, what do the people th feel? The people there feel that with the pressure of private medical hospitals in that ar 3.00m P.M.

because the poor people are getting access to free health care, there is a very powerful lob working which wants to undermine public health care in this country, and, at present, one the targets in that entire region is this institute. Therefore, it may be a coincidence, it may inadvertent that there is an absence of this object. I do not want to attribute motives anybody. That is why, I have moved a very specific amendment saying, "In the objects of t institute, please include the object of excellent patient care free of cost."

The Minister told me that he cannot say 'free of cost' that he can say 'for poor patient I said okay; you can say 'for poor patients', but I do not want it in the rules, it has to be in t objects of the institute so that nobody else comes and undermines public health care. I a sure the Minister is very committed to public health care and he has no problem in sayi that, but it could not be done.

Now, the second point. The other unique feature of this institute is the local poor peop in that area, their students, have two important facilities through this institute. One, there a specific reservation. That is, at least 20 seats out of 75 are given for the local people. Th is what is the present situation. Why poor people can access it is, this is the one institu where you can get your entire education for the cost of just Rs.10,000! In Tamil Nadu, Puducherry, in South India, in general, there is a large number of medical colleges and v know about it. This House had an occasion to discuss the loot which goes on in the name capitation fee and how many families have fallen into debt, how many suicides have bee there of children of families who could not continue paying such exorbitant fees in the nam of capitation. Therefore, they are to either drop out or they could not access medical educatio

Therefore, both these aspects are very crucial to the unique character of JIPMER. I ha spoken to him after I have moved the amendments and requested him to at least ensure th these unique features of an institute, in the absence of a guarantee in the Act, are not erode by anybody having given an opportunity to. What is the harm when you are having an A to ensure that the existing facilities are protected? The Minister says, 'I will give an assuranc on the floor of the Parliament'. The Minister says something. He says, 'I will add it in th rules'. But, why is it...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): He did not say it. He may say it. Don presume what he is going to say.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: He has already said it and that is why I have to say that we inot accept that and therefore, again I will request as far as...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): He may change his mind after listening to ır speech.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir! Is it fair? What you are doing is fair?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): No, what you are saying is that the nister said...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: He has and I am sharing it with the House. It is not a private ıversation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): He did not say. He has to reply. That is the nt I am telling you.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, in the reply also he will say it. He is going to say it. He d it to me. He will say it to the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): But then you say, "he said it outside".

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Inside or outside, he said it. The point is, Sir,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Your time is four minutes. You have taken ht minutes.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Thank you for your generosity. Sir, one important point I I am sure there are many trade unionists here. My friend Panyji is also a trade unionist. knows that generally in the Act there is a specific clause for disciplinary action of ployees. It is taken for granted in conditions of service. But, here, you have a very specific use in which it is stated that if there is an inquiry and an employee is found guilty, such ıalty maybe imposed on the basis of evidence adduced on such an inquiry and it shall not necessary to give such a person an opportunity of making representation on the proposed ıalty. This is against the principles of natural justice. I have every right to appeal against penalty which is imposed on me. But, here by an act, which you want Parliament to adopt, ı want to change the whole labour law architecture and add this in the law and say...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Don't respond.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: They have the right. But, every Government servant has right to appeal against the penalty. Please don't try and tell me. That much I know. You are ing away the principles of natural justice by saying you cannot appeal against such a ıalty. How is it possible and you want us to pass such an Act? Therefore, I move that this deleted and I would like to say that, Sir, as far as the medical system in this country is ıcerned, there are very few institutions which even today are serving the poor and I would uest the Minister to ensure that such an institute like JIPMER and Pondicherry should suffer the fate that many other institutes have done and, therefore, I hope the Minister I once again reconsider this issue and accept the amendments that I have moved and ıble us to support the Bill. Thank you.

SHRI SU. THIRUNAVUKKARASAR (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, this existing institution MER is there in Pondicherry since 1964. For the past 44 years, this institute in Pondicherry

is serving not only Pondicherry people...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: It is not Pondicherry but Puducherry.

SHRI SU. THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: Yes, yes, I welcomed that Bill. This institute was very helpful to people to Tamil Nadu also. People from all the neighbouring districts used to go there. Madam Brinda Karat also mentioned here. Poor people from Puducherry and Tamil Nadu like to go to the hospitals because of very good service in JIPMER. Only Rs. 104 crores is given as budgetary support for this institute. It is functioning under the Health Ministry. Now, after the Bill is passed, it is going to be declared as an institute of national importance, like AIIMS here or the Post Graduate Institute in Chandigarh. We expect that a lot of money is sanctioned and allotted to this institute. It is a welcome step. I welcome it. One of the things which Shrimati Brinda Karat, Shri Bal Apte and Mr. V. Narayanasamy mentioned was that in this existing institute there is reservation now. Out of 75 seats, 20 seats are allotted to the local students, the native of Pondicherry people. There should be a guarantee in the Bill for them because Pondicherry is a backward State and people are very poor. As mentioned by others, going to a private college costs more. Nowadays, in private colleges, capitation fee is Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 lakhs. So, the benefit which is enjoyed by the local students should not be taken away by this Bill. There should be a guarantee in the Bill for them. This is my first point. My second point is when the seats are increased in future there should be proportional increase in the reservation also. Supposing today it is 75, tomorrow it will increase to 150. So, accordingly, reservation also should be increased in future. My third point is, the treatment is given free of cost there. So, it should continue in the coming institute of national importance also. Free treatment should be given at least to the people who are living below the poverty line. The third one is, under Clause 13 (f) (i) of the Bill, the Institute can start one or more medical colleges, one or more hospitals, etc. It is at page 4 of the Bill, under Clause 13. Under the same Clause, it has been mentioned that the Institute can establish and maintain a dental college, a nursing college. I would like to know from the hon. Minister that when you are allowing the Institute to set up one or more medical colleges and one or more well-equipped hospitals, why don't you apply the same thing under Sub-Clause (iii) and (iv) of Clause 13(f). You can use the phrase "one or more dental colleges" under Sub-Clause (iii) and "one or more nursing colleges" under Sub-Clause (iv), in place of "a dental college" "a nursing college" in both the Sub-Clauses. So, Sub-Clause (iii) read as: "one or more dental colleges" and Sub-Clause (iv) "one or more nursing colleges."

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is it?

SHRI SU. THIRUNAVUKKARASAR: It is there at page 4, Clause 13 (f) (iii) and (iv). So, instead of mentioning as 'a dental college', 'a nursing college', you can use the phrase "one or more dental colleges" under Sub-Clause (iii) and "one or more nursing colleges" under Sub-Clause (iv) as has been done in the previous clauses. So, I request the hon. Minister to amend these clauses accordingly.

Sir, the fourth point is this. I am also a Member of the Standing Committee on Health and Family Welfare. The Committee visited Puducherry and interacted with the people, employees, students, staff and with everybody. They were agitated. They had doubts in their mind about this Bill. The Committee promised them that it would look into their problems. They want participation. At that time, Shri Amar Singhji was not there and Shri Digvijay Singh led the Committee. He was representing the Committee.

Sir, when the Government is constituting a Committee — monitoring or high-level — why cannot it give representation to the students union, employees union, and also staff union? All the three unions can be given representation in the Committee, so that their problems will be sorted out in the Committee. And, when you are including the Vice-Chancellor of MGR University, Chief Secretary of Puducherry, why cannot you include the Chief Secretary of Tamil Nadu? It will be useful in so many ways.

You cannot see it as a separate....*(Interruptions)* It will be useful to both the States. So, I support this Bill. But, at the same time, I request the Minister to take care of all the points that I have made. (Ends)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Hon. Members, the time allotted to this Bill is only one hour. And, one hour is almost over. So, everybody will be brief. *(Interruptions)* I will not ask you to stick to your party time. You can speak more, but...*(Interruptions)* No such talks please. *(Interruptions)* Let us not waste time. *(Interruptions)* Dr. Maitreyan, please start.

DR. V. MAITREYAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, on behalf of my party AIDMK, I strongly oppose this Bill. The JIPMER traces its origin to 1823, when a medical school and hospital, called *E col de Medicina Pondicherry* was established by the then French Government. When the Union of India took over the territories of Pondicherry, it was clinched by an Agreement, called De Facto Agreement, dated 21st October, 1954. As per that Agreement, any change in the functioning system of the hospital shall be only with the consent of the people of Puducherry. The Agreement was signed by the then Prime Minister of India, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, who signed this in his capacity, not only as the Prime Minister, but also the Minister of External Affairs from our side, and Mr. O. Austorar, Ambassador extraordinary and very potentiary of France in India. The UPA Government has forgotten the need to honour the tenets of such an agreement between two nations. It is a solemn undertaking, given by the Government of India, which also finds a place, as a condition, in that agreement. About JIPMER, people have mentioned so many things. It is a premier institution. It has inpatient strength of 2500, and an outpatient strength of 500 per day. Eighty per cent of the load of patients comes from Tamil Nadu and twenty per cent from Puducherry, and five per cent from other States. The Hospital has got an excellent cancer centre, which caters to the needs of the cancer patients. It also performs open-heart surgery, angiographies, etc., etc. All these facilities are availed by the patients, who cannot afford to spend money on the treatment, absolutely free of cost. In short, it is a hospital that helps the poorest section of the people by providing free treatment. For gross personal reasons, the very character of the JIPMER to be converted into an autonomous body, instead of the present one. There has been a systematic attempt to demolish medical institution of excellence. The AIIMS is already over. Now, it is the turn of the JIPMER. The medical fraternity is watching this with anguish, and I am also included in that. It is watching with anguish that this demolition is presided over by the Health Minister who himself happens to be a doctor. If an autonomous body takes over the affairs of the JIPMER, the patients will have to pay, at every stage, for the facilities, which they are now availing free of cost. And, that is something which is very contrary to what the original agreement stood for. As mentioned by Brindaji, there have been continuous agitations in Puducherry and neighbouring areas. Also, the JIPMER staff members, in thousands, have been agitating. Their agitation is not for their personal gains. It is not for their promotion; it is not for increment in their salaries, etc. They are agitating for the cause of the society. They are agitating for the cause of the poor patients, who are benefited by this institute. Again, the

people have mentioned about the seat allocation of 20, out of 75. This too is not guaranteed by this Bill. I have been told, because I have not been a part of the Committee, that many of the unanimous recommendations of the Standing Committee have not been taken care of in this Bill. In fact, concerned by the severity of the agitation, which shook that part of the country, my party leader, the former Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Madam Jayalalitha, even wrote to the then President of India, Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam, on 19th September, 2006 to draw attention to the gravity of the situation. Considering all the above facts, and in view of the agreement and the solemn assurance given by the first Prime Minister of this country, I strongly condemn this Bill, I oppose this Bill and I request the Minister to take back this Bill. Thank you. (Ends)

SHRI ABANI ROY (West Bengal): Sir, JIPMER hospital is a Central Government Hospital in Puducherry. For a long time, the staff of the JIPMER and the people of Puducherry agitated and shouted not to make it an autonomous body. They wanted it to remain as a health service under the Central Government Health Service so that they could get facilities at minimum cost. I do not know why the Health Minister is thinking of making it autonomous. What interest is there, I do not know. This is a Central Government Hospital and everything was given from the Central Government. In Puducherry, very, very poor people are living there. The people from outside Puducherry, that is, from Tamil Nadu border also go there. But, when I asked the Health Minister, once upon a time, when the agitated people came here, he said that if it is autonomous, he will give more money. He can spend more money there. From the same fund the money will go there. Then, why cannot it be under the Central Government, what is the problem?

Secondly, before the agitation started, I went there. One person, who was posted there by the Ministry of Health, Government of India, created more problems there. At that time also, I was there with the staff and students. When the people of Puducherry, the staff members of the hospital and others do not want it to be an autonomous one, why is the Central Government interested in making it autonomous and not to keep it under the Central Government Health Service? Some amendments have been given by Smt. Brinda Karat. But, so far as the students are concerned, so far as the staff is concerned, so far as the poorer sections of the society is concerned, I do not know whether the hon. Minister is going to allow all these facilities there or not. Even the fee for the outdoor patients and everything will be increased. That is why, we have requested the Minister for this. And, every time, the people, who came from Puducherry, also made this request. Mr. Narayanasamy is here; he knows all these things. I am, practically, in favour of it being under the Central Government Health Services and not to make it autonomous. But, autonomy means, you can give the money, but, I do not know what will be accountability of money. That is my apprehension. So, I think, so far as the people of Puducherry, so far as the staff of JIPMER, so far as the staff of JIPMER are concerned..(*Time-bell*) Sir, I am concluding. In spite of that, while supporting whatever amendments have been made by Smt. Brinda Karat; if they are included in the Bill, then, we can support it, provided the students and staff are also included in the committee. Thank you.

SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR (Maharashtra): Sir, I stand to support the Bill and I only want to endorse a few of the recommendations that have been made by my other esteemed colleagues. Sir, what has hurt me the most in this Bill is the provision on page 8 where there is a proviso which says, "Provided that where it is proposed after such inquiry to impose upon him any such penalty, such penalty may be imposed on the basis of evidence adduced during such inquiry and it shall not be necessary to give such person an opportunity of

making representation on the proposed penalty". Sir I have been a trade unionist for 41 years now. I have led six-and-a-half lakhs officers of this country. I have been in the International Labour Organisation. Sir, I have studied the labour laws not only of this country but of the entire world. But, I am yet to come across an obnoxious provision where a penalty is proposed, and a show-cause notice is not given, defence is not heard and the entire course of natural justice is completely obliterated. Whoever has drafted this has a mind which is anti-employee, anti-democratic and anti-people. If this is what you are expecting, then, any Director will ride roughshod over the employees and there will be a rule of terror in the entire Institution. I, therefore, oppose this particular provision that penalty can be imposed without giving a show-cause and without giving all the facilities of natural justice to an employee.

My second point is, the autonomy of these Institutions is very important and it should not be subordinated to any other political considerations\.

My third point is this. Two very wholesome recommendations have been made by Shrimati Brinda Karat that this Institution must protect the present fee structure and also continue to provide patient care, delivery services; free of cost these recommendations are very important.

Sir, I also want to raise one issue of my own because the hon. Minister for Health and Family Welfare is here. He has been bringing about a lot of improvements and I am not the one to decry everything that he does. In some areas, he has brought about positive reforms and he has to be appreciated for that. But I must say that there is one area in which there is a continued neglect in the entire health sector, and that is, of our young doctors, whether it is in Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, any State including the capital city of Delhi. These young men during their apprenticeship and thereafter ..*(Interruptions)*.. work very hard. Today, pay structures in all the sectors have gone up so high that the medical services, particularly, the person who has passed the MBBS, is the 26th in number, in terms of his compensation after graduation. There are MBAs who are drawing ten times more salary than a medical student who saves the lives of other human being. Sir, of course, we are making rural service compulsory for them and all that; that may be feasible or necessary, but what I am trying to say is that, at least, their service conditions should be gone into very thoroughly. They are living in very dingy conditions. In a room of 10" x 10", about 5, 10 doctors are living, and (*Time-bell*) proper toilets are not being provided for them, proper payment is not being provided for them, and, as a result, they can't look after themselves. Somebody who has done B.Com. (Pass) and does some computer course, today, is getting something about Rs.50,000 per month, in this very country, as salary. Sir, the entire younger generation of medical fraternity is today indeed distressed, and our young Health Minister should do something for them to revise their salaries, revise their service conditions and revise their living conditions at the earliest. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Now, Mr. Minister.

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, kindly give me just two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): No; no; the time is over. You see, one hour was the allotted time for this Bill, and one-hour-and-ten-minutes have already been spent on this. Now, the Minister has to speak.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, can you allow me just two minutes?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): No; I cannot do like that.

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, kindly allow two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): You should have given your name earlier.

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I will confine myself to two minutes only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): The point is, there is a Short Duration Discussion. Okay; you can speak, but take only two minutes.

SHRI D. RAJA: Yes; Sir.

Sir, I come from Tamil Nadu and I know the JIPMER and its problems very well. In fact, when Comrade B. Subbaiah, one of the veteran leaders of my party was the Health Minister in Pondicherry, as it was at that time, in cooperation with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the whole idea of setting up the JIPMER was conceived and the Institute was set up. It is a college and hospital, and it is catering to the needs of not only the people of entire Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, but even the other States of South India. We agree the Institute needs a kind of upgradation. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: That was in 1964. Why do you go to 1971? ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes; he was the Health Minister, not ... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, what is this? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): There is shortage of time. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Raja, please address the Chair.

SHRI D. RAJA: Sir, I only said that both the former Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and one of the veteran communist leaders held consultations and cooperated with each other to bring that Institute. What is your objection?

Anyway, Sir, the point here is that that Institute needs upgradation and we have no problem that this institution gets functional autonomy. But the point here is, how to make it more efficient. Here, I think, we had several informal consultations how to strengthen the Bill. Our hon. colleague from CPI(M) has also moved certain amendments which need due consideration by the Ministry, by the Government, so that the Bill can be accepted unanimously. Sir, I am simply making that point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Yes; Mr. Pasha.

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA: Sir, Mr. Raja has already said what I wanted to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Okay.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, please give me three minutes only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Ahluwaliaji, first you listen to me and then you decide. I want to help you.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I will speak for only three minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Okay; but remember it. Speak within three minutes.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, since afternoon, we are discussing this Bill and the Government was trying to convince other political parties to get it passed, to get it through. It went to the Standing Committee and the Standing Committee made certain recommendations.

Sir, the point is, they are not going to construct a new hospital with this Bill, but they are upgrading a Government hospital which is working for the poor section of that area and which is doing a very good exercise. They are responding to the needs of the area and the people were asking for certain other facilities. But that doesn't mean that it should be converted into an autonomous body and captured for a particu'ar purpose. The point is, the essence and the spirit of that particular hospital should not go. But, as I understand, so many recommendations were there of the Standing Committee. But all were not accepted. Although the speakers who spoke earlier on this Bill, who participated in this discussion, supported this Bill, but, fortunately, I saw the amendments moved by Shrimati Brinda Karat. And I thought that we will be failing in our duty if we do not accept these amendments because, as Shrimati Brinda Karat had remarked while she was speaking that there was an all-party agitation going on in Puducherry against this Bill. We were also a part and parcel of that agitation and we had also participated in that agitation. I talked to the concerned people there. They had said that till their demands were accepted, they were not going to accept it. So, I think, whatever amendments she had suggested, we all support them. So, now, if you want to put the amendments to vote...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Now, Mr. Minister, please.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Or, my humble submission is that, if you want to...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): No. Let the Minister reply.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: If you want to bring the Bill to be passed unanimously, it is better...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Mr. Minister, please.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I have not yet finished. I have suggested that if you accept these amendments, it is all right, or, otherwise, I would request the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to keep this final decision on hold, have consultations, come back with the Bill today itself after an hour or two and let us pass it unanimously; and accommodate all the amendments because that has been the spirit behind what all agitated people have been demanding for. That will be reflected in the Bill. I am saying this because, ultimately, this Bill is meant for Puducherry.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I respect the distinguished Chief Whip of the principal Opposition. I would like to submit on behalf of the Government that because the Bill has been piloted by the concerned Minister, he will speak on this. As you know, in the Cabinet system, if any amendment in addition to the decision of the Cabinet is to be accepted, it has to be taken up to the Cabinet for approval. The Minister got the mandate of the Cabinet in the spirit of the recommendation of the Standing Committee. The Prime Minister had chaired that meeting and gave him the mandate to bring in the amendments. I do not think, in any other Bill such long amendments have been proposed to a Bill for an institution, and it has been done here. That is number one. Secondly, we are prepared to accommodate many things in the rule, because you can frame the rules any time you like but the moment you put everything in a jacket of this law, then you will have to go back to the Cabinet. Thirdly, I would not like to question anybody' wisdom. Then, if I get one example of any health institution managed by the Government at the Centre or in the States where there is a law that the fee structure shall remain in the law book, I shall correct

my ignorance. I do not think it is there anywhere in India or anywhere in the world...

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: If it is a Government institution, it should be there.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: I will produce a number of cases. I know of hospitals where there is no regulatory Act pertaining to the fee structure and free patients. It is always a prayer to make the paid bed free and to provide concessions. It is nowhere in the Act. You may insist and say that you will not support it. Then, I will have to go back to the Cabinet. And we can come back with it only if the Cabinet gives the mandate...*(Interruptions)*... And, I shall come back with the Act for other States. I will come back with an Act also for Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh and other States. I will not come empty-handed.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, just for your information, I would like to tell that even in the DDA ...*(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You will be given chance to speak when the amendments are taken...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I would like to say that even in the DDA...*(Interruptions)*.. Recently, what had happened with Escorts? What had happened with Appollo? On DDA land, 25 per cent beds are reserved for them for free treatment.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am prepared to accept his suggestions. If everybody agrees to give us, at least, one hour's time, we can talk to the Prime Minister. I have to talk about Cabinet matters to the Prime Minister. I cannot simply commit in the House...*(Interruptions)*.. Therefore, if it is acceptable to all, we shall come back to the House. If not, we would go back to the Cabinet. I cannot ask the Minister to go beyond the Cabinet's approval and to accept whatever is proposed. That is not practical.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: There is no problem, Sir. You may take your time, go back and have consultations, and bring it back with a unanimous decision. What does the Minister have to do now?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Let me say. ..*(Interruptions)*.. Please ..*(Interruptions)*.. Mr. Minister, if you accept the proposal, which has been supported by the Parliamentary Affairs Minister and if the House agrees, then we can postpone it for one hour. But you have to say whether you agree to it or not because you are pilot in the Bill.

DR. ANBUMANI RAMDOSS: I go by what our Parliamentary Affairs Minister says. If the House agrees, after one hour, maybe we could have a discussion, and then we can bring it back to the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Does the House agree with the proposal of the hon. Minister?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): That is agreed to. Now, we will take up *(Interruptions)*..

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Let him come tomorrow.

SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI: Let it be after one hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Ahluwaliaji, you yourself said one hour.

Now it cannot be changed. One hour is decided. Now, we take the Short Duration discussion.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Situation arising out of misuse of funds provided by central government under national rural employment guarantee programme

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Puducherry): Sir, I would like to raise here a very important subject. Earlier, on several occasions, in the form of questions and Short Duration discussion, the issue of misuse of Employment Guarantee Scheme Funds by various States has been raised in this august House.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA) in the Chair.]

Sir, day in and day out, there are reports from NGOs and from some independent bodies that the funds meant for National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme are being misused in this country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is a very important subject. The UPA Government in the Common Minimum Programme has clearly indicated that there should be job opportunity to the poor people living in the villages because urban people are getting employment with the infrastructure industry, service industry and with other industries. But people in the rural areas, the farm labours, when there is off season, are not able to get employment and they have to sit idle at home and their families suffer and starve. Therefore, the UPA Government under the leadership of hon. Prime Minister and also the UPA Chairperson, the hon. Congress President, initiated the move, which was supported by all our alliance, that there should be job guarantee for the rural people provided by the Government themselves. Therefore, the scheme was implemented by the Government about two years back. Funds were provided. The salient feature of the Scheme is that in the rural areas, Adivasi people, the Scheduled Castes people, backward classes people, farm labour and the people who are not employed will get employment for 100 days in a year. And, the minimum wages should be paid at the rate of Rs.80 — in some of the States, it varies. — and that employment should be provided to one member of the family, either male or female member; one family — one job. Under that Scheme, the funds were provided by the Central Government to the States. Ninety per cent is the Central Government's share and ten per cent is the State Government's share. The job card is to be issued by the State Government to the poor people. On the basis of job card, the Gram Panchayat will give employment opportunity to them. The funds are given by the State Governments at the Gram Panchayat level, Tehsil level and also at the District level. The District Collector is the monitoring authority. That is the Scheme which is being implemented and it has got a wide welcome from the people of this country. Crores of unemployed people got employment and for one member in each family, provision was also made under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme that 33 per cent of the beneficiaries should be women. Out of the total persons given employment, 33 per cent ladies should be employed in rural areas. This is a very noble scheme, accepted by the people of this country. Implementation has been made in various States. Sir, whatever money was required by the State Government on the basis of enrolment made, the Central Government sent the money. But, unfortunately, at the State level, at the implementation stage, there is lot of corruption, mismanagement, misuse of funds. The jobs are not being given as per the guidelines issued by the Government of India. We have raised this issue several times. But, Sir, in this country, in the Northern part of the country, there are tribal people and the tribal people live in